

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated April 18, 2006, the Examiner issued a restriction requirement between Group I (claims 1 – 24) and Group II (claims 25 – 30). The Examiner asserted that the inventions of Group I and Group II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. Applicant respectfully submits that this characterization is incorrect.

In the present application, claims 1, 14, 17, 20, 25 and 31 are independent. Claims 1 – 13 are directed to a spoken language interface mechanism. Claims 14 – 16 are directed to a computer program product implementing a control mechanism to provide recognised spoken input recognised by an automatic speech recognition mechanism. Claims 17 – 19 are directed to a computer implemented spoken language system for enabling a user to provide spoken input. Claims 20 – 24 are directed to a method for providing user input to an automatic speech recognition system. Claims 25 – 30 are directed to a development tool for creating components of a spoken language interface mechanism. Applicant submits that newly added independent claim 31 is also directed to a development tool as recited in claim 25, with the further recitations of the limitations of claim 1 to clarify the present invention. No new matter has been added.

Taken as a whole, claims 25 – 31 recites a development tool for creating components of a language recognition system, hence, the spoken language interface system of claims 1 – 19 is related to the development tool of claims 25 – 31 as a product and tool for making the product. Claims 20 – 24 recite a method of using an automatic speech recognition (language interface) product, hence, the method of claims 20 – 24 is related to the language interface mechanism of claims 1 – 19 as a product and method of using the product. While the

preamble of independent claim 25 recites a development tool for creating *components* of a spoken language interface mechanism, the claim body does not recite the tool as comprising any of the components of claims 1 – 19. Therefore, it is clear that the language interface mechanism of claims 1 – 19 and the development tool of claims 15 – 31 are not related as combinations and subcombinations. As for the method of claims 20 – 24, the method merely recites steps for using an automatic speech recognition mechanism. Thus, it is also clear that such a method is not related as a combination and subcombination with the development tool product as recited in claims 25 – 31.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has mischaracterized the relationship between the different groups of the claims, and requests that the restriction requirement be withdrawn and all claims be considered.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0591, under Order No. 17087/002001 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 5/17/06

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas K. Scherer
Registration No.: 45,079
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)